

ERIC GRANT  
United States Attorney  
STEPHANIE M. STOKMAN  
JAMES R. CONOLLY  
Assistant United States Attorneys  
2500 Tulare Street, Suite 4401  
Fresno, CA 93721  
Telephone: (559) 497-4000  
Facsimile: (559) 497-4099

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
United States of America

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
JUSTIN GRAY,  
  
Defendant.

CASE NO. 1:20-CR-00238-JLT-SKO

UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION TO MOTION  
FOR DISCLOSURE OF EVIDENCE [Docket No.  
2022]

DATE: October 29, 2025  
TIME: 1:00 p.m.  
COURT: Hon. Sheila K. Oberto

The United States, by and through Assistant United States Attorneys Stephanie M. Stokman and James R. Conolly, submits its opposition to the motion for discovery, filed by defendant Justin Gray ("defendant"). ECF 2022. Defendant's motion should be denied as the footage they request is not in the possession of the government or any investigating agency involved in this case, and any footage referenced in text messages has been provided already to defendant.

The government has repeatedly indicated that it is not in possession of the requested discovery. The government has requested from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) the item of discovery (Ring camera footage) at issue in defendant's motion on numerous occasions. Detectives assigned to this investigation from LASD are not in possession of the item, and despite the indications that the item was sent via text message to one of the detectives, it was not preserved by LASD and there is nothing for the government to obtain.

Furthermore, the item defendant requests has been provided to defendant, as mentioned in defendant's Motion, as the camera footage was sent by the resident of the home from which it was recorded to defendant Johnson's team during the preparation of the January 2025 trial. The government only became aware of any preservation of this footage at that time, when defendant Johnson provided the footage as one of his trial exhibits. Seemingly, the footage that defendant seeks here is the same footage that Johnson was able to obtain from the homeowner. Thus, not only should this motion be denied because the footage was never in the government's possession from law enforcement, but it should be denied as moot since the footage that seems to exist, as obtained by Johnson's team, has in fact been sent to defendant.

**I. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, defendant's motion for discovery should be denied.

Dated: October 19, 2025

ERIC GRANT  
United States Attorney

By: /s/ Stephanie M. Stokman  
STEPHANIE M. STOKMAN  
Assistant United States Attorney